

Independent claim 13 generally parallels claim 1, reciting that the dispatcher invokes at least one process that dynamically binds to a processing context which defines an action to be executed in response to an event in order to provide the requisite communication service identified by the message associated with that event.

Independent claim 15 recites a telecommunications system generally as above wherein the message handling object forms a message associated with an event communicated thereto by a processing context (also executing within the system) and transmits that message to the communication device. The message handling object discerns events and forms messages associated therewith from selected ones of a plurality of message fragments received from the device. The dispatcher exchanges events and their associated messages between selected processing contexts and the message handling object to effectuate activation of selected communications services defined by the messages.

The remaining independent claims are directed to methods generally paralleling the foregoing, reciting further or different limitations thereon.

The sole cited reference, Chang, is understood to provide little disclosure relevant to the pending claims. Although Chang does pertain to telecommunications devices, nowhere is it understood to teach the use of message handling objects to discern messages from fragments received from external devices. Nothing contained in the passages recited by the Examiner, to wit, col. 2, lines 7-29; col. 5, lines 3-15; col. 6, lines 4-14; col. 8, lines 40-63; col. 10, lines 19-49; and col. 14, lines 16-19, appear to discuss this. Indeed, a review of those passages, as well as a search of the document as a whole, fails to uncover any treatment of the processing of message fragments — much less, the discerning of events or construction of whole messages therefrom.

Nor does Chang appear to teach or suggest the use of a dispatcher to invoke processes to process events discerned from fragments, to dynamically bind a processing context to a communication services, and/or to exchange events and messages between context. Specifically, no discussion of such appears in the passages cited by the Examiner (enumerated above), nor is such otherwise evident upon review of the document.

Page 4

For these reasons, among others, Chang does not anticipate, render obvious or otherwise detract from patentability of the claimed invention. The Applicant therefor respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,
NUTTER, McCLENNEN & FISH, LLP



12/30/04

David J. Powsner
Reg. No. 31,868

Attorney for Applicant
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02110-2604
Tel: (617)439-2717
Fax: (617)310-9717